



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

period, and his work is more scholarly and better organized. He is almost the first to give in English any adequate account of the social teachings of Morelly. So completely has the name of Rousseau overshadowed the pre-revolutionary era that the more definitely radical philosophy of Morelly has had but scant attention. Sharing with Helvétius and D'Holbach in the denial of innate ideas, he proceeded to a denial of the resulting right of private property. While much nearer to the world of actual experience than the early utopians, he shared their fascination with the remote and the primitive. He was largely responsible for the reigning fetish of the time, "le bon sauvage", and for the worship of the state of nature. Like his contemporaries, he was deficient in exact historical knowledge and like them he attempted to supply the defect by what has been well termed "conjectural history". His claim to rank as a predecessor of the modern scientific socialists rests chiefly on his insistence on collective ownership of production goods only, as distinguished from the universal communism of his contemporaries.

In connection with his treatment of the Revolutionary Radicals, Mr. Guthrie has given a brief but, on the whole, an adequate presentation of the socialistic tendencies of the Revolution. He is unquestionably right in his contention that much of the revolutionary legislation which is often classed as socialistic was in reality not based on any economic philosophy but was an outcome of the pressing necessities of the time. His emphasis on the importance of Barnave's contribution to socialistic thought is perhaps a shade too pronounced, and he has hardly given sufficient weight to Saint-Just's social programme.

The book, particularly in the earlier chapters on More and Campanella, loses some of the readable quality by reason of its labored style and frequent reiteration of statement. The generalizations are usually accurate and suggestive. But it is hardly correct to say that "a large part of the discussion of socialism up to the work of Ferdinand Lassalle may be called academic" (p. 34), for Mr. Guthrie has himself shown that a definite class-conscious movement even antedated the Revolution. Nor is it quite accurate to state that Babeuf was "out of sympathy with those who had liberty as their ideal" (p. 296), since Babeuf's later communistic programme was but an amplification of his earlier devotion to a narrowly political type of reform. But these minor defects do not seriously detract from the genuine merits of a book which must be welcomed as a really important contribution in a neglected field.

ULYSSES G. WEATHERLY.

The Strength of Nations: An Argument from History. By J. W. WELSFORD, M.A. (New York, London, Bombay and Calcutta: Longmans, Green and Company. 1907. Pp. x, 327.)

"In this book an attempt is made to examine the fiscal question in the light which European history from the commencement of the

Christian era sheds upon it." Many statements in the book are open to criticism, but none is more misleading than this, the first sentence of the preface. The book is not an examination of the fiscal question in the light of European history, but an examination of European history in the light of the fiscal question, or rather in the twilight of a partizan view of fiscal reform. It is not history, but as its subtitle truthfully says, "An Argument from History".

The argument, in brief, is as follows. Production and trade are two distinct things. Trade is not necessarily an evil, but it is dangerous. "In the past, trade, when unregulated by the State, has always ended by ruining national production, which is the only permanent source of national strength." The Western Roman Empire fell because the metropolis was not productive; it received its imports as tribute, and gave no exports in return. Constantinople enjoyed a longer life, because it depended on trade as well as tribute, but it prepared its own decline by conceding commercial privileges to the Venetians. This "fiscal madness", by the way, was repeated by England in the French commercial treaty of 1860. "The fatal legacy of international trade" passed to the Italian cities; and Italy was ruined by free importation. Germany had an opportunity to rise to the position of a great power, but the movement toward national unity was associated with a movement for tariff reform, and when the plan of an imperial customs system was rejected the way was paved for the troubles of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Spain imitated Rome. Holland sacrificed strength for wealth, and declined because it supported trade rather than production. France became strong in the seventeenth century under a protective system. She prospered even in the eighteenth century. Her fall, however, was being prepared by the "Circle-Squarers", as the author terms the Physiocrats, and the acceptance, under their influence, of the Eden treaty of 1786 brought on the Revolution. "Free-trade historians probably scored their greatest triumph when they obscured the simple causes which led to the Reign of Terror. They have made people believe that a peculiarly oppressive feudal system existed in France in the eighteenth century", but the author sets us right on that as on many other points of recent history.

Mr. Chamberlain's proposals have roused such feeling in England that a participant in the discussion of fiscal reform can scarcely be expected to approach his subject in a judicial temper. It is hard, however, to find excuses for the utter heedlessness of this historical essay. The author lists altogether some four score books as authorities for his statements. Scarcely a dozen of these belong to the field of economic history. The author has selected what facts he wanted, from any convenient repository, and has put them in a setting which is entirely of his own fabrication. The contributions which scholars have made to our knowledge of the history of commercial policy are ignored. Even when the author cites a book of recognized authority,

such as Cunningham's *Growth of English Industry and Commerce*, he culls from it only the statements which he can use to further his own argument, and disregards all others. Mr. Welsford's book can be recommended to classes which are studying the pathology of history, and want a morbid specimen for examination; it can serve no other good purpose.

CLIVE DAY.

The Political History of England. In twelve volumes. Edited by WILLIAM HUNT, D.Litt., and REGINALD L. POOLE, M.A. Volume VII. *The History of England from the Accession of James I. to the Restoration (1603-1660).* By F. C. MONTAGUE, M.A., Astor Professor of History in University College, London. (London and New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1907. Pp. xix, 514.)

ALMOST side by side the two co-operative histories of England now appearing, the six-volume series edited by Professor Oman, and the twelve volumes under the direction of Mr. Hunt and Mr. Poole, approach completion. Last year was issued Mr. Trevelyan's *Age of the Stuarts* in the one, and now comes Professor Montague's *Political History of England, 1603-1660*, in the other, covering the first half of the period pre-empted by its predecessor. It would seem at first glance that this was an unfortunate situation. Yet, so variously does the historical muse present herself to her followers, almost the only point of contact between the two volumes in question is the sense of contrast inevitably roused by their almost simultaneous appearance. Two books, covering the same period, dealing, presumably, with the same set of fairly well-known facts, and, if one may judge from editorial utterance, with much the same purpose, could not well be more different. Professor Montague's book is, in other words, pre-eminently what its title implies, a political history. In it, social, economic, literary, intellectual, even religious elements are subordinated to political and constitutional interest. Mr. Trevelyan's book, on the contrary, laying its stress on precisely those matters which are mere corollaries to Professor Montague's main theme, is almost everything but political in the usual sense. But, different as they are in more ways than this, they unite in one thing, if only one. That is the demonstration of the dictum that "it is ill gleaning after Gardiner". It does not often happen that any one is able to make any field so completely his own as the historian of the Puritan Revolution. Not Macaulay, nor Ranke, with all their great and varying talents, were able to do as much. It is, in consequence, no easy task, in many ways it is not a desirable one, to do more than epitomize Gardiner's work, illuminating it with additional matter drawn from the monographs of other writers on separate phases or events of the period. This, in no small measure, is what Professor Montague has done, and, on the whole, done